## Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	

## DAVID SCOTT PEASLEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

M. SPEARMAN, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 15-cv-01769-JSW

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS FOR 'E TO AMEND AND TO CONSIDER; DIRECTING FENDANTS TO RESPOND TO MOTION FOR STAY

Re: Dkt. Nos. 399, 400, 404

Plaintiff is a California prisoner proceeding pro se. Defendants have filed a motion for summary judgment on his sole remaining claim (Count 6). Plaintiff has filed an opposition. The reply brief is due on or before November 7, 2022.

Plaintiff has filed motion to amend the complaint, to reconsider a prior order denying a prior motion for leave to amend, and a motion to stay. Plaintiff has still not submitted a proposed amended complaint. Plaintiff was informed three times recently that his motions for leave to amend were denied because he did not submit a proposed amended complaint. Nevertheless, he has continued to move for leave to amend his complaint without submitting the amended complaint he proposes to file. Without a proposed amended complaint, the Court cannot discern whether his claims are cognizable or leave file the amended complaint should be granted. He cannot continue to do so. No further motion for leave to amend may be filed without a proposed amended complaint. The motion for leave to amend and to reconsider are DENIED.

Plaintiff has filed a motion to stay ruling on the motion for summary judgment. He claims it was not served upon him. The proof of service indicates that various exhibits were served upon Plaintiff by mail, but the motion itself was not; it was simply filed electronically. Plaintiff's opposition responds to various arguments by Defendants, but it is not clear whether or not Plaintiff

## Case 4:15-cv-01769-JSW Document 406 Filed 10/27/22 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court

has had access to the electronically filed motion. On or before November 7, 2022, Defendants
shall either explain why the motion was not served upon Plaintiff by mail and whether or not
Plaintiff has been able to access the electronically filed documents at his prison, or serve the
motion upon Plaintiff by mail, file a proof of such service, and file a stipulation to extend the
deadlines for Plaintiff to supplement his opposition.

## IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 27, 2022

JEFFREY S. WHYTE United States District Judge